

Attorney docket TAI 134

REMARKS

In response to the outstanding Office Action:

Restriction. Claims 43-44 are withdrawn, but depend from §102-rejected claim 34, which is argued for below. It is noted that should claim 34 be allowed, then claims 43 and 44 should be reinstated and allowed.

Title. The Examiner stated that the title is not descriptive. This is respectfully traversed, as the title recites the elements also recited in the main claims, e.g., claim 2. Clarification is requested. The Examiner is invited to propose a different title.

Errors. The applicants are aware of no errors in the specification.

Update. The specification is amended to list the patent number of the parent.

Drawing. The objection to the drawing is respectfully traversed. In Figs. 2B and 2B the lands 115 take the place of the terminals 103 shown in Figs. 1A and 1B, so no numeral 103 is needed in Figs. 2A and 2B. The Examiner is referred to the specification at page 15.

§ 102, Yamashita. Claims 27 and 30 were rejected over Yamashita '387. This rejection is moot, as these claims are canceled.

§ 102, Lee. Claims 33 and 34 were rejected over Lee '722. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect, Lee does not disclose the tape carrier recited in claim 33, nor the first and second semiconductor elements both mounted on the tape carrier.

(1) The Examiner points to element 34 (Fig. 4) as anticipating the claimed tape carrier. However, Lee describes this feature as an "auxiliary lead" (col. 3, line 38). Unlike a true tape, it has no longitudinally-extending, parallel edges (such as a now recited in claim 33), nor does it have any extension at all, beyond the edge of the parts encapsulated in epoxy (col. 2, lines 56-58). Rather than being a tape, it is a frame.

Attorney docket TAI 134

It is noted that Lee uses the word "tape" to describe an object with parallel, longitudinally-extending sides (adhesive tape 42, Fig. 3 and col. 2, line 60). The fact that Lee did not use this word to denote the auxiliary lead implies that this lead is not a tape.

(2) The larger chip 21 is not "between" any edges of the auxiliary lead 34. This is contrary to claim 33, which now recites that both of the two semiconductor devices are between the edges.

§ 102, Waki. Claims 33 and 34 were rejected over Waki '292. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Element 91 in Fig. 15 of Waki is applied to anticipate the claimed tape carrier, but Waki refers to this feature as a "lead frame" (col. 11, line 4). It appears to be analogous to the lead frames 21 and 11/14 (Fig. 1). There is no disclosure of element 91 having parallel, longitudinally-extending sides or a longitudinal extension, as now claimed. The tape-automated bonding mentioned by Waki relates to the leads, not the frame (col. 1, lines 33-48). In applied Fig. 15, the tape leads are the elements such as 97a (col. 11, line 2).

§ 102, Nakamura. Claims 33 and 34 were rejected over Nakamura '467. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Nakamura discloses a tape 4 in Fig. 5. However, contrary to claim 33, there is only a single semiconductor element to which all the leads, both short and long, are attached.

The Examiner asserts that Fig. 24 shows "a first semiconductor element 2 ... a second semiconductor element 2," thus applying a single reference numeral and a single illustrated element to anticipate two distinct elements in the claims. This characterization is respectfully traversed. While Fig. 17 shows two chips each labeled as "2," there is no indication that of these two, one has short leads and the other has long leads, and both chips appear to be identical in outline. Instead of long leads to a first chip and short leads to another, Fig. 24 is a plan view showing exactly one semiconductor device 2 with different length leads to that one.

Attorney docket TAI 134

Allowed Claims. Even-numbered claims 2-16 were allowed.

Allowable-subject matter claims 35, 45, and 47 are rewritten in independent form and should now be allowable.

Withdrawal of the objections and rejections, and allowance, are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

March 1, 2005
Date

Nick Bromer
Nick Bromer (Reg. No. 33,478)
RABIN & BERDO, P.C.
CUSTOMER NO. 23995
Telephone: (202) 371-8976
Telefax : (202) 408-0924

I certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (fax no. 703-872-9306) on March 1, 2005.

Nick Bromer [reg. no. 33,478]

Signature Nick Bromer